
AN
ENQUIRY
WHEN

The *Resurrection* of the Body, or FLESH,
was first inserted into

THE
PUBLIC CREEDS.

[Price One Shilling.]

page

ENQUIRY



The Record of the
was first printed in 1751

PUBLIC RECORDS

(Price One Shilling)

AN 2649

ENQUIRY

WHEN

The *Resurrection* of the BODY, or FLESH,
was first inserted into

THE

PUBLIC CREEDS.

By the Late

ARTHUR ASHLEY SYKES, D.D. //

Publish'd from the Author's Manuscript

By his Brother G. SYKES, A.M.

L O N D O N :

Printed for A. MILLAR in the *Strand*.

M DCC LVII.

AN
ENQUIRY

WHEN

The Registrar of the Board of Trade
was first introduced into



PUBLIC CREDITS

By the late

Arthur Ashley Sykes, D.D.

Revised from the Author's Manuscript

By his Brother, G. Sykes, A.M.

LONDON:

Printed for A. Mark in the Strand.

M.DCCCIV.



THE
P R E F A C E.

IT may be justly questioned, Whether there was any particular set Form of a *Creed* made or left by the Apostles, upon Profession of which Persons were admitted to Baptism. What is commonly called, *The Apostles Creed*, plainly was not made by Them. They seem to have instructed the *Gentiles* in the Belief of the *One God*, the Maker of all Things, and in the Duty they were to pay Him as the Father of all; and then They proceeded to acquaint them, *How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with Power. — That He was*

P R E F A C E.

Lord of all ---- *and that He was ordained of God to be the Judge of Quick and Dead. Acts x. 34--42.* This was what the Apostles taught the *Gentiles*, and pressed upon them by various Arguments, *preaching Peace by Jesus Christ unto Them.*

A Faith in God was already openly professed by the *Jews*; and therefore there was no Need of a particular Instruction of Them in That Article. But then They were to be put in mind of what they knew; and They were to be pressed to *Act* according to their Knowledge; and they were to be instructed to *worship God in Spirit and in Truth.* They had the Law and the Prophets, and in Them there was an express Promise made to their Fathers, That in *Their Seed should all the Earth be blessed.* The Apostles therefore instructed the *Jews* how this Promise was made good: They taught them that *Jesus* was this promised Person, eminently known among them, and expected by Them under the Name of *The Christ.*

P R E F A C E.

It was not long after the Resurrection of our Saviour, that the Apostles received a Commission from Him to go into all Nations, and to *make Disciples* unto Him, *Baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe whatever he had commanded them.* The *Holy Ghost* had been promised to be sent by our Lord; and his *Office* had been described, whilst our Saviour was with the Disciples, and conversed openly with them: And during the Forty Days after his Resurrection, They were commanded *not to depart from Jerusalem, till they had received the Promise of the Father* made to them by Christ; and which afforded so strong a Confirmation of the Truths taught by Christ. The Rule of Faith therefore, in the Beginning, was comprized in the short Creed of *One God the Father, the Maker of all things; and in One Lord Jesus Christ his Son; and in the Holy Ghost, the Paraclet, sent by Christ.* And all such as professed thus much were baptized, and deemed to be complete *Christians.*

P R E F A C E

When I say that such were deemed to be *complete Christians*, I do not mean that such had nothing further to learn or to do. They had the Scriptures to search : They were to observe the Things there delivered concerning the Nature, Mission, and Commission of Christ : They were to learn what was said concerning the Kingdom of Christ, and its Laws, and the several Dispensations of God : They were to learn what was the Office of Christ : They were to enquire what the Prophets had taught about Christ : They were to be instructed in the Peace of God offered by Christ : The Conditions on which it was offered ; and in short into whatever they could discover relative to God, or to Christ, or to what he taught, or to themselves as his Disciples. But then all these Things were not required to be known *previous to Baptism*, but were to be learned as Men made a Progress in the Word of God, that inexhaustible Source of Wisdom and Knowledge.

The

P R E F A C E.

The learned Dr. Grabe was of Opinion, that the *Catechumens* were not, *previous* to their *Baptism* instructed in the Doctrine of the *Conception* of Jesus Christ *from the Holy Ghost*, or, of his *Birth* of the *Virgin Mary*; but that these Doctrines were reserved for a *further Opening* after Baptism. *Vid. Annotata ad Bulli Judicium, c. vi.* It is indeed highly probable, that these and other Doctrines were taught as Circumstances arose, either to explain some Things inculcated in the Gospels, or to avoid some Thing erroneous. And hence it was, that the *original Creed* was enlarged, and more and more Things inserted into it; and indeed all that has been added to it, seems to have been owing to these Causes. Those who are desirous to see on what *particular Occasions* Articles have been added to the Creed, may consult those learned and great Authors Bishop *Pearson*, Bishop *Bull*, and his Annotator Dr. *Grabe*; the Author of the *Critical History of the Creed*, and our Ecclesiastical Antiquarian Mr. *Bingham*.

It

P R E F A C E.

It is not my Design to examine into the *History* of the *Creed*. All that I intend is, to shew how insensibly Doctrines are changed: That, in a plain Instance, a Variation from the *Words* of Scripture is, and has been the Means of introducing a different Doctrine from what is contained in them: That what is pretended to be an Explication of Scripture, is often more hard to be understood than the Scriptures themselves are: That the Additions and Interpretations of Men, often quite change the Truths of the Gospel: That when in Process of Time one false Notion is taught or established, *that* is made the Foundation of another, and thus at length *Transubstantiation* itself has been made the Doctrine of Christ. I do not say, nor would I be understood to insinuate, that all and every Change of Doctrine is attended with Consequences so gross, or so destructive of common Sense as *Transubstantiation* is, or even as some *καθωμιδνημένα διδασχαι*, commonly taught Doctrines, are: But my View is to shew how the Gospel has been changed, and
made

P R E F A C E.

made liable to Objections, which in itself it is not liable to. And if any Objection is an Obstruction to the Reception of Christianity by any Person whatever, it may merit Consideration, where the Fault lies,—Whether in those who do not believe Christianity, because it seems to them (as it is represented) to contain Doctrines incredible, or in those who *teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.*

A N

P. R. E. F. A. C. E.

made liable to Objections, which in itself is
is not liable to. And if any Objection is an
Objection to the Reception of Christianity
by any Person whatever, it may meet Con-
sideration, where the truth lies. Whether
in those who do not believe Christianity, be-
cause it seems to them (as it is represented)
to contain Doctrines inconsistent, or in those
who were for Doctors the Commandments of
Moses.



AN
ENQUIRY

WHEN
The Resurrection of the Body, or Flesh,
was first inserted into

THE
PUBLIC CREEDS.

T seems in general agreed among learned Men, that the Creed which goes under the Name of the *Apostles Creed*, was not composed in its present Form by the *Apostles*, but was made up at different Times, partly from the Articles required in the New Testament in order to Baptism, and partly in Opposition to *Heretics* who arose in early Days, and partly in Opposition to Gentilism, and the Doctrines introduced by such as were made Converts from thence. The very short Creed, which at first was deemed sufficient to entitle Men to *Baptism*, was no other than a Faith in *God the Father almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and*

in Jesus Christ *his Son our Lord, and in the Holy Ghost*. There might be some Variation of *Expression* in these Articles; but still the *Sense* was the same; and so long as these Doctrines were closely adhered to, as Practical, and Useful in the Reformation of Life, so long was Christianity preserved pure, and in its *Virgin State*, and was a vital Principle of right and true Action. But as soon as Men began not to be content with the Simplicity of the Gospel, but were for introducing *Knowledge* instead of Regulation of Manners, they made Religion consist in Metaphysics, and vain Philosophy, and perverted the End and Design of Christianity. Those who were instructed *as the Truth is in Christ*, readily believed all the Doctrines of Christ, and lived as Men that had Hopes in Christ. They believed that He was Lord, and Judge of all, that He was *ascended up into Heaven*, and would *come again*; that there would be a *Resurrection of the Dead*, and a *Judgment of Quick and Dead*; and that all were to *repent from evil Works*. And therefore when the Apostle was mentioning the *Foundation*, or *first Principles*, in which Converts to Christ were instructed, he reckons nothing else but *Faith towards God*, the *Doctrine of Christ*, *Repentance from dead Works*, the *Resurrection of the Dead*, and *Eternal Judgment*. When He adds the *Doctrine of Baptisms*, and *Laying on of Hands*, it was because These were *Rites* used at that Time to all such as became Converts to Christ, and were to be *baptized in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. They were all instructed in these *Rites*, that they might understand the *Whole* of their Initiation.

It

It is well known, that in the *Heathen World* they believed in *Gods many, and Lords many*: And among the *Jews*, there was a full Expectation of One whom they called *The Messiah*; a Person in whom all the Nations of the Earth were to be blessed; and who was to reign over the House of Jacob for ever, and of whose Kingdom there was to be no End. Hence the First Article taught to a *Heathen* was a Belief in God, or *The One God, the Father almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth*: And to both *Jew and Heathen*, a Second was added, That *Jesus* was *The Christ*. And as He was to be believed in what He promised, and in fact he had promised to send *The Holy Ghost*, so a Third great Article of Faith was added --- That They did believe in the *Holy Ghost*: By which they meant, that they believed that the *Holy Ghost* was sent by Christ according to his Promise. And thus was This Article understood, when in the Fourth Century they first began to explain what they understood to be the Meaning of --- *I believe in the Holy Ghost*.

The First Additions to the Baptismal Creed seem to be made with Design of forming Right Notions of the *Son of God*: But it was long ere they added other Points not immediately relative to Him. The Insertions of, *The Holy Catholic Church*, the *Remission of Sins*, the *Resurrection of the Body*, and *Life everlasting*, did not make part of the *Baptismal Creed* before the Middle of the IVth Century. And as to the Article of the *Resurrection of the Body*, Bishop Pearson cites no Authority for it earlier than *Ruffinus*. If he imagined, that it was not in any Creed before *Ruffinus's* Days, He was certainly mistaken; for it occurs in some before His Time, as will appear hereafter. It is the Ob-

servation of that Learned Expofitor of the
 “ Creed, that though we in our *English* Creed
 “ say, We believe *the Refurrection of the Body*,
 “ yet neither the *Greek* nor *Latin* ever delivered
 “ this Article in Those Terms, but in These,
 “ *The Refurrection of the Flesh.*” It follows pre-
 fently in a Note --- “ The *Greeks* always use,
 “ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις; the *Latins*, *Carnis Refurrectio-*
 “ *nem.* And this was to be observed, becaufe,
 “ being we read of *Spiritual Bodies*, some would
 “ acknowledge the Refurrection of the *Body*, who
 “ would not acknowledge the Refurrection of
 “ the *Flesh.*” How far the *Greeks* in any Creed
 of Theirs used σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις, *The Refurrection*
of the Flesh, during the Three First Centu-
 ries, or even the *Fourth*, (That Century, fa-
 mous for *Creed-making*) will appear from what
 follows.

But before I proceed, it will be neceffary to
 obferve, That there is not any fuch Expreflion
 in the New Testament as *the Refurrection of the*
Flesh; no, nor of what we have in our Creeds
 in the Morning and Evening-Service of our
 Church-Liturgy, and in our Catechifm, *The Re-*
furrection of the Body, or as it is in the Baptif-
 mal Creed, *The Refurrection of the Flesh.* The
 Scriptures often fpeak of a *Refurrection*, and of
the Refurrection of the Dead: But as to the Re-
 furrection of *the Body*, or of the *Flesh*, there is
 not one Word. And therefore that fuch an Ar-
 ticle was required *at firft*, to be professed in or-
 der to Baptifm, can never be proved. When
 St. Paul was at *Athens* he preached *Jesus* and the
Refurrection, *Acts* xvii. 18. And we find him
 frequently fpeaking of *the Rifing of the Dead*.
If the Dead rife not at all, why ftand we in Jeo-
pardy every Hour? 1 Cor. xv. 30. And in the
 Verfe

Verse preceding ---- *If the Dead rise not, why are they then baptized for the Dead.* Be this Place as obscure as you please, yet the Phraseology is determinate and clear, that *the Dead rise*: And That is the Use I would make of it. And, if I mistake not, in this one Chapter, the Expression of *the Resurrection of the Dead* occurs at least Ten Times, and not once is there such a Word as *the Resurrection of the Flesh*, or *the Resurrection of the Body*.

But not to leave this Passage as if it were quite unintelligible, I would observe, that the Apostle is here reasoning against Some that denied the *Resurrection of the Dead*: And he argues, *If Christ be preached that He rose from the Dead, How say some among you, that there is no Resurrection of the Dead?* 1 Cor. xv. 12. Having then made good his Argument from the Resurrection of Christ to the Resurrection of Others, ver. 23. and having treated of the Reign of Christ in the following Verses, He resumes his Argument at ver. 29. *Else what shall they do who are baptized for the Dead?* If the Dead do not rise, it is the highest Folly for any one to be initiated into a Religion whose fundamental Article is a Belief of a Good, *ὡς περ νεκρῶν*, for those that die. Why will any engage in a Profession of Future Good to such as die? They that act upon such a Principle must be guilty of gross Folly, or gross Absurdity.

But whether This be the Meaning of this difficult Passage or not, I cannot but observe, that when St. Paul apologized for himself before Felix, his Language was the same as it was here ---- *This I confess, that I hope towards God, that there shall be a Resurrection of the Dead,*

both of the Just and Unjust. Acts xxiv. 15. He certainly intended, an universal Resurrection of all Mankind; for *as by Man came Death, so also by Man came the Resurrection of the Dead.* 1 Cor. xv. 21.

If we look into our Saviour's Preaching, He never calls this otherwise than *the Resurrection*, or *the Resurrection of*, or, *from the Dead*. Thus, *But as touching the Resurrection of the Dead, have ye not read Matt. xxii. 31.* The Question put to him was, *In the Resurrection whose Wife shall she be?* And his Answer was, ----- *In the Resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in Marriage.* They were certain of the Sadducees (*who deny that there is any Resurrection*) *Luke xx. 27.* who put the Question to our Lord, --- *In the Resurrection whose Wife of them is she?* And the Answer of our Lord is ---- *They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that World, and the Resurrection from the Dead ---- are the Children of the Resurrection.* Now that the Dead are raised, &c. ver. 35, 36, 37. When the Apostles went to preach the Gospel in the World, they taught in such a manner, that the Sadducees were grieved that they preached through Jesus the Resurrection from the Dead. Acts iv. 2. And when the Philosophers at Athens heard St. Paul preaching Jesus and the Resurrection, Acts xvii. 18. they plainly enough understood him as preaching *The Resurrection of the Dead*, ver. 32. And as to St. Paul's own self, His great Endeavour was, that He might attain *The Resurrection of the Dead*, Phil. iii. 11. And I have already observed, that when he laid down the first Principles of the Doctrines of Christ, One was *The Resurrection of the Dead*, Heb. vi. 2.

It

It may appear strange, that so often as mention is made of the *Resurrection* of the *Dead* in the New Testament, not once is there any mention of the *Resurrection* of the *Body*, or of the *Flesh*. To raise the *Dead* occurs, *Matt.* x. 8. *Acts* xxvi. 8. to raise up us, *1 Cor.* vi. 14. *2 Cor.* iv. 14. *The Dead are raised up*, *Matt.* xi. 5. To raise from the *Dead*, or *the Dead shall be raised up incorruptible*, *1 Cor.* xv. 52. But still *the Body*, or *Flesh*, is never mentioned as to be raised again. We have indeed Notice taken of our waiting for the *Adoption*, viz. the *Redemption of our Body*, τῷ ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆ σώματος ἡμῶν, *Rom.* viii. 23. But as this relates to That State of Happiness which we are now hoping for, and which we are hereafter to enjoy, it is not a *Resurrection* of our Bodies, but a *Freedom* or *Deliverance from the Bodies* that we bear about us, that the Apostle has in view. And indeed when the Question was put concerning the *Resurrection*, (which was thought by some as impossible as to make twice Two equal to Twenty) when the Question was --- *With what Body shall they come?* the Apostle does not answer, that Men shall rise with their *present Bodies*, or in the *Flesh* which they bore about them, either in their *Lives*, or at their *Deaths*, but he treats the curious Enquirer with no great Compliment, and answers, *Thou Fool*, and adds, *That God will give us such a Body as he thinks proper on such Occasion*, *1 Cor.* xv. 36---38.

There is indeed one Text which says, that Christ is the *Saviour of the Body*, *Eph.* v. 23. But the Apostle is not there speaking of the *Body of Flesh* which at present we all bear about us, but of a *Body Mystical* or *Political*, of which

Christ is the Head, viz. the Church. He is the Saviour of all Christians, whom he came to save from all their Sins. And, in another Epistle, the same Apostle assures the Romans ----- if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the Dead, dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the Dead shall also quicken your mortal Bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you, Rom. viii. 11. But Here too the Apostle is not speaking of the Resurrection at the last Day, but concerning what was to be done at present; not of what was to happen after our Deaths, but of what we are to do before our Souls are separated from our Bodies. To be carnally-minded, says he, is Death; but to be spiritually-minded, is Life and Peace --- But you [Believers in Christ] are not in the Flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. --- And if Christ be in you, the Body is dead because of Sin, but the Spirit is Life, because of Righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the Dead [i. e. the Spirit of God] dwell in you, ver. 9. he that raised up Christ from the Dead, shall also quicken your mortal Bodies, i. e. make you mortify the Deeds of the Body, ver. 13. and live according to the Spirit, or mind the things of the Spirit, whilst you are here upon Earth.

The Doctrine then of the Gospel being thus uniform concerning the Resurrection of, or, from the Dead, the Apostles never required the Belief of any particular Modus, or Manner of it: They never said any thing of a Resurrection of the Flesh, nor Body; but left such Matters to be found out in after-times. Whatever might be the Notions of uninspired Men, either that there was to be a Resurrection of the Flesh, or of some sort of Body spiritualised, yet nothing of

of this was made an Article of Faith, or was inserted into any *public Creed*, or required of any Convert to be professed, in order to Baptism. And if we pass from the New Testament, *Barnabas* and *Clemens of Rome*, mention no more than *the Resurrection*; and not any particular *Modus* of it, or the Resurrection of the *Flesh*, vide *Barnabas*, c. *xxi*. *Clemens*, c. *xxiv*. *Clemens* indeed in his 2d. Epistle, mentions the Resurrection of the *Flesh*: But that is allowed to be not genuine. *Ignatius* too speaks as the Scriptures do.---*The Father* will raise up us. *Ep. ad Trallianos*. And in the larger Epistle to the *Ephesians*, he speaks of the Resurrection ἐκ νεκρῶν, *from the Dead*: But he never mentions any thing of a Resurrection of the *Flesh*.

But soon after this the Language changed in Christian Writers, and *Justin Martyr* tells us, that Christ shall come a second Time, as the Prophets had foretold, when τὰ σώματα ἀναγερῆ πάντων τῶν γενομένων ἀνθρώπων, *He shall raise the Bodies of all Men that have been*, p. 87. This was *Justin's* Opinion; but it was not in any *Baptismal Creed*: For he tells us of no other Article, but that all were baptised, ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁλῶν καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ, καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, *in the Name of God the Father and Lord of all Things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit*, p. 34. And hence it is, that he speaks of *Jesus* as the Son of the true God, υἱὸν ἀληθοῦ τῆ ὁλῆως θεοῦ, and tells us in what Rank or Order they placed him, καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες, *Holding him in the second Place, and the prophetic Spirit in the Third*. *Just. Apol.* 2^{da}. p. 60. But he takes no Notice of any Article of any Creed as containing the Notion of the Resurrection of the *Flesh*, whatever his own phi-

philosophical Notion of the *Resurrection* might be. It was soon after this that *Polycarp* suffered, and he mentions *the Resurrection* twice in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, c. ii. 5. In the former Place it is, ἡμᾶς ἐγερῆ, *he will raise up us*: In the Second it is, that Christ promised, ἐγείρας ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν, *to raise up us from the Dead*. And in this he speaks as the Scriptures do. But then in the Epistle of the Church of *Smyna*, that gives an Account of his Martyrdom, a Prayer of the Martyrs is recited, wherein he mentions the *Resurrection of eternal Life, Soul, and Body*, ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου, ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος. But by the Time when this Letter was wrote, the Notion seems to have prevailed among Christians, that the *Body* was to be raised, tho' it was not yet got into any of their Creeds. For soon after the Middle of the second Century, Disputes arose about the Resurrection, the *Heathens* objecting to the Possibility of it, and the *Christians* endeavouring to answer the Objections they met with. The Enquiry was, Whether there was to be a Resurrection of the *Soul* alone, or of the *whole Man*, consisting of *Body* and *Soul*? And then a second Question was, Whether the *Flesh*, the *very Flesh* which now we bear about us, was to be raised up again?

The Writers of that Time still extant, contended for the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, together with the *Soul*. *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch* tells *Autolichus*, (a learned Heathen who had wrote against the Christian Religion) ἀναγείρει σου τὴν σὰρκα ἀθάνατον σὺν τῇ ψυχῇ ὁ θεός. *God raises up the Flesh, and makes it immortal with the Soul*, p. 74. And *Athenagoras* wrote a peculiar Tract on this Subject, and pleads that *the Man* consisting of *Body* and *Soul*, is to be raised again: But there

there does not appear to be any *Creed* which established such a Doctrine. For whatever private Persons might imagine to be *true*, was not instantly to be *professed* as an *Article of Faith*, necessary to be *believed* in order to *Baptism*.

The next in Point of Time is *Irenæus*, if he be not more properly cotemporary with *Theophilus* and *Athanasoras*; for *Irenæus* published his Books against Heresies, *A. D.* 176, or 177. And *Athanasoras's* *Apology* was wrote about two or three Years after; and *Theophilus's* Tract was wrote about 170. There are in *Irenæus* a shorter and a longer Paraphrase of the grand Principles of the Gospel drawn up almost like *Creeds*. But as they do not agree in *Words*, nor consist of the *same Articles*, but differ in many Instances, they cannot be looked upon as *Creeds* of any Church, but as Summaries of the Doctrines of Christianity, drawn up in this Author's own Form. The shorter Summary seems to be most like a Creed, as it contains the Doctrine " which many barbarous
" Nations, diligently keeping the antient Tradition" observe as their Rule. " Believing in
" one God Maker of Heaven and Earth, and
" of all Things in them by Christ Jesus the Son
" of God, who thro' his most eminent Love towards his Creature, underwent that Generation which was of a Virgin, he by himself
" uniting Man to God, and having suffered under *Pontius Pilate*, and being rose again, and
" taken up in Splendor, will come again in Glory,
" a Saviour of them that are saved, and a Judge
" of them that are judged, sending into eternal
" Fire the Perverters of Truth, and the Despisers of his Father, and of his own Coming
" again. I. iii. c.

In unum Deum credentes fabricatorem cæli & terræ & omnium quæ in eis sunt per Christum Jesum Dei Filium. Qui propter eminentissimam erga Figmentum suum dilectionem, eam quæ esset ex Virgine Generationem sustinuit, ipse per se hominem adunans Deo, & passus sub Pontio Pilato, & resurgens, & in claritate receptus, in gloria venturus Salvator eorum qui salvantur & iudex eorum qui judicantur, & mittens in ignem æternum transfiguratores veritatis & contemptores Patris sui & adventus ejus. Irenæ, lib. iii. c.

In this *Summary* of Christian Doctrines we find no Notice taken of the *Resurrection* of the *Flesh*, or *Body*, at all : Nor indeed of any Resurrection, further than as it may be *inferred* from Christ being a Judge and Avenger of such as deserve Punishment or Reward. And indeed, it is a *defective* Representation of the antient Creed, as it takes no Notice of the *Holy Ghost*, notwithstanding it contains a fuller Exposition of some Points than was originally taught.

In the other and larger Account of what he says the Church received from the Apostles and their Disciples, he is much more explicit. Εὐχὴν Θεὸν πατέρα, &c. “ The Church received a Faith
 “ in One God the Father Almighty, the Maker
 “ of Heaven and Earth and Seas, and all Things
 “ in them, and in one Jesus Christ the Son of
 “ God, who became Flesh for our Salvation;
 “ and in the Holy Ghost who preached by the
 “ Prophets the Dispensations, and the Comings,
 “ and Generation of the Virgin, and the Passion,
 “ and the *Resurrection from the Dead*, and the
 “ Assumption of the beloved Christ Jesus our
 “ Lord in the Flesh, and his coming from the
 “ Heavens in the Glory of the Father, to gather together all Things, and to *raise up all*
Flesh

“ *Flesh of all Men*, that to Christ Jesus our Lord
 “ and God, and Saviour, and King, according to
 “ the good Pleasure of the invisible Father, every
 “ Knee should bend of Things in Heaven, and
 “ Things on Earth, and Things under the Earth,
 “ and every Tongue should confess to him, and
 “ that he may do a right Judgment in all: The
 “ spiritual Things of Wickedness, and the An-
 “ gels that transgressed and have been in Apo-
 “ stacy, and the Impious, and Unjust, and Trans-
 “ gressors, and Blasphemers, he may send into
 “ everlasting Fire, but to the Just and Holy,
 “ and Observers of his Commands, and to such
 “ as continue from the Beginning in the Love
 “ of him, or repent, granting Life, he may
 “ give Incorruption, and vest them with ever-
 “ lasting Glory.” *Irenæ. lib. i. c. 2.*

In this longer Paraphrastical Account of the Doctrines “ received from the Apostles and their “ Disciples,” there are several Articles which were never put into any *Baptismal* Creed. Many particular Doctrines are here said to be *preached by the Holy Ghost*, which a Candidate for *Baptism* was never required to profess at that Time. The *Resurrection of the Flesh* began now to be a currently received Doctrine; but yet it was left out of the *shorter* Summaries; whereas all fundamental Doctrines were necessarily inserted into the Creeds. But when Men collected their own Sentiments, and at large recited such Things as suited their particular Purposes, they put into such *Summaries* whatever they thought proper, and did not confine themselves to the Precision of a Creed.

And this we find to be the Case of *Tertullian*, he has done exactly the same as *Irenæus* did; he has drawn up no less than *three* Formulas of Faith;

Faith; and in *one* of these no Mention is made of the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, tho' that Article appears in the other two. It is plainly an Inference drawn from the Doctrines taught in those Times about the *Resurrection*, and not an Article of any public Creed. For when this Writer comes to consider, *Quo titulo spes ista præscripta sit.*--On what Authority the Hope of the Resurrection of the Flesh was founded? He answers, *Unum opinor apud omnes edictum Dei pendet, Resurrectio mortuorum, The Declaration of God is but one to all, the Resurrection of the Dead. Tert. de Resur. carnis, c. xviii.*

In his Book against *Praxeas*, *Tertullian* recites what he says he *always* believed, viz. "In unicum Deum---unici Dei sit & Filius Sermo ipsius qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt & sine quo factum est nihil. Hunc missum a Patre in Virginem, & ex ea natum hominem & Deum, filium hominis & filium Dei, & cognominatum Jesum Christum. Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, & sepultum secundum Scripturas, & resuscitatum a Patre, & in cælos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos, qui exinde miserit secundum promissionem suam a Patre Spiritum Sanctum, Paracletum, Sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem & Filium & Spiritum Sanctum." *i. e.* He believed in one God,---and that his Word was the Son of the one God; who proceeded from him; by whom all Things were made, and without whom nothing was made. [He believed] that he was sent by or from the Father into the Virgin, and from her was born Man and God, the Son of Man, and the Son of God, and named Jesus Christ. That he suffered, that
" he

" he died, that he was buried, according to the
 " Scriptures, and raised up by the Father, and
 " taken up into Heaven, sits at the right
 " Hand of the Father, will come to judge the
 " Quick and Dead : Who from thence sent ac-
 " cording to his Promise from the Father, the
 " Holy Ghost the Paraclet, the Sanctifier of their
 " Faith, who believe in the Father, and Son,
 " and Holy Ghost." *Tertull. adv. Praxeam. c. 1.*

Tertullian tells us, that this Doctrine was the
 general Doctrine that had been taught among
 Christians from the Beginning. " Hanc regu-
 " lam ab initio Evangelii decucurriffe, etiam ante
 " priores quosque hæreticos, nedum ante Praxeam
 " hæsternum." That *this Rule had been observed*
 " and adhered to from the very Beginning of the
 " Gospel; that it was prior to all Heretics that had
 " been in the Christian Church, not to say Praxeas
 " that was but as Yesterday." Every one must
 see that in this Rule, no mention is made of the
 Resurrection of the *Flesh*. A *Resurrection* is pro-
 fessed, because the *Quick and Dead* are to be judg-
 ed by Christ; but as to the Resurrection of the
Flesh, or *Body*, he does not tell us, that that No-
 tion was delivered from the first Preaching of the
 Gospel.

It is true, that he delivers us another Form of
 Faith, in his Book, *de Velandis Virginibus*, shorter
 in many Points than that before recited, but with
 an Addition of the Clause of the Resurrection
 of the *Flesh*. His Rule in this Place is, " Cre-
 " dendi in unicum Deum omnipotentem mundi
 " conditorem, & Filium ejus Jesum Christum,
 " natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pon-
 " tio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis,
 " receptum in cælis, sedentem nunc ad dextram
 " Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos
 " per

“ per carnis etiam Resurrectionem.” “ To believe in one God, Almighty, Maker of the World, and in his Son Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin *Mary*, crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, the third Day raised from the Dead, taken up into Heaven, now sitting at the right Hand of the Father, will come to judge the Quick and Dead, even by the Resurrection of the Flesh,” *cap. 1.* This Rule of Faith he calls *unalterable, not to be amended, immobilis & irreformabilis*; and indeed this has more the Appearance of a true Symbol, than any of the others which *Tertullian* has recited. But yet those Words, *per carnis etiam Resurrectionem, even by the Resurrection of the Flesh*, are so manifest an *additional Explication* of the preceeding Words, *the Dead*, that if we admit this to have been the Creed of the *African Church*, yet still the *Explication* must be struck out as no Part of the Creed, But what evinces it not to have been a Creed at all, is, that here is no mention of the *Holy Ghost*, a Doctrine universally taught to all that professed Christianity; and which *Tertullian* enlarges upon in this very Treatise afterwards.

Nor is his *third Form*, or *Rule of Faith*, which he lays down in his Book *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, any Creed of any Church, but only a Summary of the Doctrines of the Gospel, drawn up by himself, that his Adversaries might see and know what it was that he undertook to defend. This was---“ *Unum omnino Deum esse; nec alium præter Mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit per verbum suum primo omnium demissum. Id verbum Filium ejus appellatum, in nomine Dei varie visum a Patriarchis, in Prophetis semper auditum, potestremo delatum ex Spiritu Patris Dei & virtute,*

"tute, in Virginem Mariam, carnem factum in
 "utero ejus, & ex ea natum egisse Jesum Chri-
 "stum, exinde prædicasse novam legem, & no-
 "vam promissionem regni cœlorum: Virtutes
 "fecisse: fixum cruci: tertia die resurrexisse; in
 "cœlos ereptum sedisse ad dextram Patris; mi-
 "sisse vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti qui creden-
 "tes agat; venturum cum claritate ad sumendos
 "sanctos in vitæ æternæ & promissorum coelef-
 "tium fructum, & ad profanos adjudicandos
 "igni perpetuo, facta utriusque partis resuscita-
 "tione cum carnis restitutione." c. 13. *There is*
but one God; no other besides the Maker of the
World, who produced all Things out of nothing, by
his Word first of all sent down. That Word being
called his Son, was in the Name of God in diffe-
rent Manners seen by the Patriarchs, always heard
in the Prophets, lastly, of the Spirit and Power of
God the Father, brought into the Virgin Mary,
made Flesh in her Womb, and being born of her be-
came Jesus Christ: From that Time preached the
new Law and new Promise of the Kingdom of Hea-
ven; worked Miracles, was crucified, rose again
the third Day, being taken into Heaven, he sat at
the right Hand of the Father, he sent the Power
of the Holy Ghost to act in his Place, who should
operate on Believers; he was to come in Glory to take
the Holy to the Enjoyment of Life eternal, and the
Happiness of Heaven, and to judge the Wicked to
everlasting Fire. Both Parts of us being raised
up, with the Restoration of the Flesh.

Tertullian in this Place undertakes to prove, that
this Rule was instituted by Christ, and that among
Christians, there were no Debates or Controversies
about these Things, unless what Heresies had intro-
duced, and such as made Men Heretics. "Hæc
"regula a Christo, ut probabitur, instituta; nul-

“ las habet apud nos quæstiones, nisi quas hæreses inferunt, & quæ hæreticos faciunt.” *ibid.*

Upon these several Formula's of Faith one cannot but observe,

1. The Expressions made Use of, are so different in the Articles which correspond together in *Sense*, that either none of them was the established Creed of the Church, made Use of at the Admission of Profelytes to Baptism; or if one of them was, it is impossible to say which was. It cannot be this *Last*, which he says *was instituted by Christ*; for Christ never instituted such *Creed*: Nor did Christ ever teach any thing about the *Restoration of the Flesh*. Nor could it be the *Second*, because there is no mention of the *Holy Ghost* in it: And if we admit the *first* Formula, that has said nothing about the Resurrection of the *Flesh*. The Truth is, *Tertullian* delivered in his own Words what he took to be the *Sense* or general Doctrines among Christians; and as he was a zealous Assertor of the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, and had wrote professedly for that Notion, it is not to be wondered at, that he should treat this Opinion as a Doctrine of Christianity, tho' it was no more than his own *Explication* of the Doctrine of the Gospel, in his warm Way made to be an Institution of Christ's.

2. It is certain, that the Controversy about the *Resurrection of the FLESH*, did not begin till the Middle, or near the End of the Second Century: And then, as Philosophers objected to the *Resurrection* itself from the common Topics, *How could Flesh, devoured by Beasts or Fishes, and thus become Parts of those Animals; or perhaps reduced by Fire to Ashes, or dispersed by Seas and Rivers, be restored? Athenagoras, and Theophilus, and Tertullian, undertook a Defence of this No-*
tion;

tion; and taught, that it was no ways beyond the Power of *Almighty* God to restore to every one the *Flesh* he once had. How far they succeeded, is not the Point at present: They might have shewn, that the *Resurrection* of the *Flesh* is no where taught in Scripture: The *Resurrection* of the *Dead*, is no Ways liable to any of the Difficulties which the other Notion may be liable to. For may there not be a *Resurrection* of the *Dead*, without the *Resurrection* of *Flesh*? May not the *dead Person* be raised to Life, and have a *Body* given to him suitable to the Place he is to have? May not the *thinking, conscious* Person be restored, tho' he has not that restored which has no *Thought*, nor *Consciousness*, belonging to it? And why should Christianity be encumber'd with Notions that the Scriptures have not so much as once mentioned? But these Men beginning, others followed; and at length, it grew to be the Doctrine of the *Church*; but it was not inserted into any *Creed*, till long after these Times; nor did it make a distinct Article of Faith, as now it does, how strenuously soever it was defended by the greatest Advocates in those Days.

Nothing material to this Point passed from this Time till *Origen*, about the Year 240, or thereabouts: And in his Works we meet with some Instances of Creeds, in which one might expect to find an Article relative to the *Resurrection* of the *Body* or *Flesh*, had any Baptismal *Creed* contained such Article. In his Commentary on

St. *John*, he gives us this Form; Πρῶτον, says he, πισεύσον ὅτι εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας, καὶ καταρτίσας, καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τῆς μηδενος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα· χρὴ δὲ καὶ πιστεύειν ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς· καὶ πάση τῇ περὶ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν Θεότητα καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα ἀληθείᾳ· Δεῖ δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον

πιστεύειν πνεῦμα· καὶ ὅτι αὐτεξέσται ὄντες κολαζόμεθα
μὴν ἐφ' οἷς ἀμαρτάνομεν· τιμώμεθα δὲ ἐφ' οἷς εὖ
πράττομεν. “ Believe that there is one God, who
“ created all Things, and directs and made all
“ Things from not being to be. You must believe
“ too that Jesus Christ is Lord; and to every
“ Truth concerning him, both as to his Divinity and
“ his Humanity. You must also believe in the Holy
“ Ghost; and that we being free Agents, shall be
“ punished for our Sins, and shall be rewarded for
“ those Things that we do well.” Origen. Com.
in Johan. Tom. 2. p. 397. This is not indeed
a direct proper Creed, but yet as the great Arti-
cles into which all Christians were baptized, viz.
the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and the Belief
of future Punishments and Rewards is so di-
stinctly recited; and no mention is made of a
Resurrection of any Body or Flesh, one may rea-
sonably infer, that no Creed in his Time contained
any such Notion.

There is another Treatise, said to be Origen's,
and wrote against the Marcionites, in which the
riter sets down a direct Form of Creed, just as
Tertullian had done, that it might appear in one
View, what he designed to maintain, or make
good. It stands thus. “ Ἐνα θεὸν καὶ κτίστην καὶ δημι-
ουργὸν τῶν πάντων εἶναι πεπίστευκα, καὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ
θεὸν λόγον, ὁμοῦσιον, αἰεὶ ὄντα, καὶ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων καιρῶν
ἄνθρωπον ἐκ Μαρίας ἀναλαβόντα, καὶ τέλει σαυρο-
θέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν. Πιστένω δὲ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ
πνεύματι τῷ αἰεὶ ὄντι. i. e. I have believed that
there is one God, the Creator and Maker of all
Things: And God the Word, from him, consubstan-
tial, ever existing, and in the last Times taking Man
of Mary, him crucified, and risen from the Dead. I
believe also in the Holy Ghost, who always is. Orig.
c. Marcion. p. 3.

One

One Part of this Debate is about the *Resurrection*, wherein *Marinus a Bardefianist* contends, that not the *Body we bear about us*, a fluctuating Substance, different from itself at different Ages, but *spiritual Bodies*, or rather the *Soul alone*, will rise. *Adamantius*, i. e. *Origen* all the Way insists on it, that the *very Body which encompasses us*, is to arise. There is nothing in the *Creed* recited, any Ways relative to the *Resurrection*, except it be that Christ arose, ἐκ νεκρῶν, *from the Dead*. And if there had been in the usual Forms of the *Creed*, into which Profelytes or others were baptized, any such Article as the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, it is very probable that *Adamantius* would have put it into his *Creed*: especially since so great a Part of this Dialogue turned upon this Subject. But instead of that, this *Creed* ends as the *Creeds* of those Days did, (and even many Years after) with the Belief of the *Holy Ghost*. But as this *Creed* has certain Marks of later Times in it, what Regard is due to it, is left to the Reader's Judgment.

I proceed next to *Cyprian*, who does not take any Notice of any such Article as the *Resurrection of the Flesh* in the Baptifmal *Creed* of his Time. He has in two feyerall Places taken Notice of the Question put to the Person to be baptized, “Credis Remissionem Peccatorum, & Vitam eternam per Sanctam Ecclesiam?” *Do you believe Remission of Sins, and Life everlasting thro’ the Holy Church?* Ep. 69. And again, “Credis in Vitam eternam, & remissionem peccatorum per sanctam Ecclesiam?” *Do you believe in Life everlasting, and Remission of Sins thro’ the Holy Church?* Ep. 70. Edit. Fell. Here we first meet with this new Article of *Remission of Sins thro’ the Holy Church*; and by the Manner of

putting it to the Catechumen, this was an Article of the Creed : but he never mentions the *Resurrection of the Flesh* as in the Creed ; nor did it in his Time stand in the Place that afterwards it obtained, *between* the Article of *Forgiveness of Sins*, and, *Life everlasting*. It seems to have been believed currently enough by particular Persons, but not yet taken into any Creed.

About the Times of *Cyprian*, i. e. about 250, flourished that great Man *Gregory Bishop of Neocæsarea*, or *Thaumaturgus*, famed for the many *Miracles* he is said to have worked ; he has given us a *Creed*, said to have come down from Heaven. The Virgin *Mary*, it seems, put *St. John the Evangelist* upon explaining to young *Gregory*, the *Mystery of Godliness* : And the Apostle was very ready to gratify the Virgin, and *Gregory* instantly committed what was said to Writing. The Formula of Faith is very precise and minute, as to what we are to believe concerning the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost ; but there is not a Word concerning the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, or even the *Resurrection* of Christ himself. See the Creed in *Gregory Nyssenes Life of Thaumaturgus*, vol. iii. p. 546. but it is needless to transcribe a Thing that manifests itself to be a Dream or a Forgery, after the Times of the *Wonder-worker*. If the People of *Neocæsarea*, so strictly adhered to this Form of Words, as *Gregory of Nyssa* assures us, it is evident, that they had not any one Word in their Creed about the *Resurrection of the Flesh*.

I come next to the *Fourth Century*, when the *Arian Controversy* began ; and the first Creed that here occurs, was that drawn up by *Alexander of Alexandria*, and sent by him to *Alexander of Byzantium* ; it was a circular Letter, very long,
very

very full of Complaints against *Arius*, and his Notions, and very full of angry Zeal; it was wrote *A. D.* 318. And herein he says—*We believe a Resurrection from the Dead, whose First Fruits was our Lord Jesus Christ,—who in the End of Ages came down to Men to take away Sins, who was crucified and dead without any Imminution of the Divinity itself, rose from the Dead, ascended into Heaven, and sitteth at the right Hand of the Majesty.* I will give you here the Words of this Prelate, so far as the present Debate is concerned.

τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ὁίδαμεν ἥς ἀπαρχὴ γέγονεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, σῶμα φορέσας ἀληθῶς καὶ οὐ δοκῆσει ἐκ τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας, ἐπὶ συσπείλειᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀδέτησιν ἀμαρτίας ἐπιδημήσας τῷ γένει ἀνθρώπων σαυρωθεὶς καὶ ἀποθανὼν, ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τὰυτα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ θεότητος ἡτῶν γεγεννημένος, ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀναληψὶς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καθήμενος ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης. *Theodorit. Lib. 1. c. 4.*

The Debates about *Arianism* were carried on for several Years together, *Alexander* not only writing particular Letters to all the Bishops he knew, to get them to subscribe to his Opinions, but writing common *circular* Letters to all he could, to engage them in his Party, at length the famous Council of *Nice* was called *A. D.* 325. The Creed there established was remarkably canvassed; and as if it had been sent from Heaven to those 318 Fathers, it was made the Standard of true Faith for many Years. It ran in these Words, “ I believe in one God the Father almighty, Maker of all Things visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is of the Substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one Substance

“ with the Father, by whom all Things were
 “ made both those in Heaven and those in Earth,
 “ who for us Men and for our Salvation, came
 “ down from Heaven, and was incarnate and
 “ was made Man: he suffered and rose again
 “ the third Day, and ascended into Heaven, and
 “ will come again to judge the Quick and
 “ Dead, and in the Holy Ghost.” This was all
 the Creed. Then there follow some Anathema’s
 against *Arius* and his Followers; but as to the
Resurrection of the Flesh, there is not one Word,
 nor was it yet an Article of the Creed.

Whilst this Council was sitting, and great
 Debates were carrying on, occasioned by some
 unscriptural Expressions and Notions used on
 both Sides, I mean by *Arius* on the one Side,
 and by the *Nicene Fathers* themselves on the
 other, *Eusebius* recited a Creed, καθως παρελάβο-
 μεν ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ
 κατηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε τὸ λούτρον ἐλαμβάνομεν, καθως
 ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μεμαθήκαμεν, καὶ ὡς ἐν
 αὐτῷ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπιστεύομεν
 τε καὶ ἐδιδάσκομεν, i. e. “ As he had received it
 “ from Bishops who lived before him, and as he had
 “ been instructed at first when he was initiated in-
 “ to Christianity, and as when he was baptized,
 “ and as he had learnt from the Holy Scriptures,
 “ and as he believed and taught both when he was
 “ a Presbyter and when he was a Bishop.” He
 then recites his Creed; which tho’ in some
 Words little varying from the Creed professed by
 the *Nicene Fathers*, yet it has not the least Word
 concerning the *Resurrection of the Flesh*. It con-
 tains no more than the three great Articles of
 the Christian Faith, viz. a Belief in one God,
 the Father almighty, Maker of all Things visible
 and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the
 Word

Word of God, and that he died and suffered for us, and ascended into Heaven, and will come to judge the Quick and Dead; and in the Holy Ghost, believing each of these to be truly subsisting.

However it is proper to give this Creed fully in his own Words, because this was the Creed *Eusebius* was baptized into, and which he constantly used himself, and which he declared to contain his true Sense, and in which he would continue to his Lives End, as he called God and Jesus Christ to Witness. “ We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all Things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, the first born of every Creature, begotten of God the Father before all Ages, by whom all Things were made. Who for our Salvation became incarnate, and conversed among Men, who suffered and rose again the third Day, he ascended to the Father, and will come again to judge both the Quick and Dead. We believe also in one Holy Ghost. And each of these to be and exist, the Father to be truly a Father, the Son to be truly a Son, and the Holy Ghost truly a Holy Ghost, as our Lord when he sent his Disciples to preach, said, *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost.*” *Niceph. lib. viii. c. 22. Socra. l. i. c. 8.* It is needless to transcribe this Creed in its Original, since there is not a Word about the *Resurrection* of either *Body* or *Flesh* in it, nor had that Article hitherto obtained a Place in the Creed, as it now in a little Time began to do.

Arius

Arius was deposed upon what passed at the Council of *Nice*: and some Endeavours had been used to bring him back to *Alexandria* by *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis* of *Nice*. But *Athanasius* was obstinate and inflexible. Our Historians tell us, that a certain Presbyter had insinuated into the Emperor's Sister *Constantia*, how much Injustice had been done to *Arius* by the Council of *Nice*; and that she upon her Death, not daring to speak a Word to the Emperor in Behalf of *Arius*, recommends this Presbyter to her Brother, testifying his Care and Diligence, and religious Regard he had shewn to her. This Presbyter, growing in Time into high Favour with the Emperor, took an Opportunity of suggesting to him, that *Arius* was really of the same Opinion with the *Nicene* Council; that if he would permit him to come into his Presence, he would assent to the Council before him; and upon this the Emperor wrote a Letter to *Arius* to come to him. This is the story that *Socrates* has told, lib. 1. c. 25. It is much more probable that this is not the Truth; but it is not at present worth while to refute this Fiction. *Arius* and *Euzoius* were brought into the Emperor's Presence, and they delivered to him this Formula of their Faith.

Πιστευομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτωρα· καὶ εἰς κύριον ἰησοῦν χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν ἐκ αὐτοῦ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων γεγεννημένον Θεὸν λόγον, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰτε ἐν τοῖς ἔρανοῖς, καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· τὸν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς ἔρανοὺς καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς· Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρα νῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἀπὸ περσῶν ἕως περσῶν. i. e. “We believe in one God the Father

“ Almighty,

“ Almighty, and in Jesus Christ the Lord, his Son,
 “ begotten of him before all Ages, God the Word,
 “ by whom all Things were made which are in Hea-
 “ ven, and which are on Earth, who descended,
 “ and was incarnate, and suffered, and rose again,
 “ and ascended into Heaven, and will come to judge
 “ the Quick and Dead, and in the Holy Spirit, and
 “ in the Resurrection of the Flesh, and in the Life
 “ in the World to come, and in the Kingdom of
 “ Heaven, and in the Catholic Church of God,
 “ from one End of the Earth to the other.” So-
 crat. lib. i. c. 26.

Here one cannot but observe, that this is the
first Creed wherein we meet with the *Resurrection*
of the Flesh, inserted as a distinct Article by *Arius*.
 It was drawn up upon a particular Occasion, to
 engage the Favour of *Constantine*; and if not
 only this Article, but some others are professed,
 which never were in any antecedent Creed, it may
 raise a just Suspicion, that some Artifice was used
 to obtain an Interest, or to secure it in the Em-
 peror. “ *This Faith*, says *Arius*, we have learnt
 “ from the *Holy Gospels*.” What *Faith* does he
 mean? Why truly, what can be learnt only
 “ from what our Lord said to his Disciples, Go
 “ teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of
 “ the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy
 “ Ghost.” Whence then came all the new Arti-
 cles,—*The Resurrection of the Flesh*, the *Catholic*
Church of God, *from one End of the Earth to the*
other—*the Kingdom of Heaven*,—*the Life in the*
World to come,—Whence, I say, were these Ar-
 ticles? The first of these is now taught in
 the Scriptures: And this is the *first* Creed in
 which these Articles are professed: for we see *Eu-*
sebius's Creed, according to which he was bapti-
 zed, and which he used always at baptizing
 others,

others, has no such Articles, nor is it an Article of the *Nicene Creed*, nor of *Alexander's Creed* at *Alexandria*, nor of *Gregory Thaumaturgus's*; nor indeed of any Creed in former Times. This was therefore a private Creed of *Arius*; drawn up to serve a particular Occasion; and never used in the Church as a *baptismal Creed*; and tho' it contains in it the Article of the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, yet that Doctrine did not prevail till after these Times, so as to be inserted into any public Creeds. However, it must be owned, that this Creed was approved by a Synod at *Jerusalem* held in the 30th Year of the Reign of *Constantine*, *A. D.* 335, or 336, who in an Synodical Epistle to the Church at *Alexandria*, and to all the Churches in *Egypt*, &c. gave them Notice of their receiving *Arius*, and those of his Friends to Communion, upon their receiving this Creed.

I find in *Binius's Councils*, Vol. I. p. 492. Mention made of a *Roman Synod* held by Pope *Julius*, and one hundred and sixteen Bishops, in the 4th Year of the Reigns of *Constantius* and *Constans*, Oct. 1. Indication 6. wherein a Creed is recited, much the same with the *Nicene*, and not adding a Word further than *I believe in the Holy Ghost*. But this Council is justly suspected to be a forged Council, since *Julius* was raised to the Pontificate, *A. D.* 337. And the 4th Year of *Constantius* and *Constans* was *A. D.* 343. And Indiction VI. was in the Year 347. Add to this, that according to this pretended Council, *Felicianus* and *Maximianus* were Consuls; whereas *Titianus* was Consul with *Felicianus* in that Year. From all this it appears, that this *Roman Synod* was a mere Forgery: at least it may be justly suspected.

But

But whatever becomes of this Synod, we are told of a *Roman* Council held under Pope *Julius*, in the Year of our Lord, 340, whilst *Athanasius* was at *Rome*, in which his famous Creed was published. *Baronius* fixes it to *this* Year; and so does *Binius*: And the former tells us, That this Creed, together with the Acts of this Synod, was placed among the Archives of the *Roman* Church, and after many Years was there found, and published to the World. This Creed is express in saying, *At whose Coming all Men shall rise again with their Bodies, and shall give Account for their own Works.* The great Difficulty is, How a Creed of this famous Man came to lie hid so long as This did? The Truth is, it is now granted by all not to be *Athanasius's* Composition: it is now granted not to be of so early a Date as *Julius's* Days: and its latest and most zealous Defender conceives it to be drawn up by *Hilary* of *Arles*, very near One Hundred Years after the Time to which *Baronius* fixes it, viz. A. D. 429. It is not worth the while therefore to enquire further, either into the Author, or into his Creed, since we shall find the Article we are in search after to be crept into the *Western* Creeds, before the Times of *Hilary* of *Arles*.

Whilst *Athanasius* was at *Rome*, submitting himself and his Cause to the Judgment of the Pope of *Rome*, (who had no manner of Jurisdiction over him, or over his Adversaries) a Council was held at *Antioch*, A. D. 341. of *Ninety*, others say *Ninety-seven*, others say of *Ninety-nine* Bishops. It was held, *Marcellinus* and *Probinus* Coss. *Constantius* the Emperor being then at *Antioch*. *Athanasius* scruples not to call the

this Emperor, *Heretic*, and *most impious*; ἀρετικὸν ὄντα, and ἀσεβέστατον, in his Treatise *de Synodis*, p. 870. 894. Though when he wrote his Apology to This very *Constantius*, he calls him several times Θεοφιλέστατος, *beloved of God*: and in his First Oration against the *Arians* Θεοσεβέστατος and φιλόανθρωπος, *most religious and humane*, p. 288.

N. B. This first Oration was wrote near thirty-six Years after *Arius* was condemned, i. e. A. D. 361. περὶ τεράκοντα καὶ ἑξ ἔτων. *Athan.* p. 305.

They seem to be perfectly unprejudiced Persons; They disclaimed the Name of *Arians*; and they professed an impartial Resolution to reform whatever they thought amiss in the Church. They met, and examined into the Case of *Athanasius*, and his *Return*, and his taking Possession of the Church of *Alexandria*. He had taken Possession of his Church contrary to the Rules of the Church; for as he was removed from his Bishoprick by a Council, he could not be restored otherwise than by a Council. In this Council there were Three or Four Formula's of Faith drawn up. In the *First*, they tell us, what they had learnt ---- that the Son having “ πατρὶ καὶ πατρικῶς αὐτῷ βελῶ σωκε-
 “ πληροῦτα, υπονδῆναι, καὶ ἐγνητῆσαι καὶ εἰς
 “ οὐρανὸν ἀνελθῆναι, καὶ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς
 “ καθέζεσθαι, καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς καὶ
 “ διαμύοντα βασιλεῖα καὶ θεὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.
 “ Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, i. e. We be-
 “ lieve ----- that the Son having fulfilled all his
 “ Father's Will, suffered, and rose again, and
 “ ascended into Heaven, and sat down at the right
 “ Hand of the Father, and will come to judge the
 “ Quick and Dead, and will continue King and
 “ God for ever. We believe also in the Holy
 “ Ghost.”

"*Ghost*." Had these Fathers stopp'd here, they had only done as the Council of Nice had done, and no one had had reason to complain. But they go on in a very remarkable manner, and much to the present purpose. "*We believe in the Holy Ghost, εἰς δὲ δέι' πνεῦμα ἁγίου, σοφίας καὶ δυνάμεως, καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου*, i. e. if we ought to add to it, we believe also concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh, and Life everlasting." *Socr.* l. ii. c. 10. *Athanasius* has given us the same Form in his Treatise *De Synodis*, p. 892. This certainly puts it beyond all Dispute, that no Clause was in their *Baptismal* Creeds concerning the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, at that time. Soon after this, as it were repenting of this Creed, as *Athanasius* speaks, or condemning it as *Socrates*, they wrote

A *Second*, more large and full; expressing their Sentiments concerning the Son, and the Holy Ghost more minutely; in such manner that the proper Person of each, his Order and Glory, might be better understood. But still they went no farther in This Creed, than to declare their Sentiments concerning the Son's coming to judge the Quick and Dead, and their Belief in the Holy Ghost, given to Believers for Consolation, and Sanctification, and Perfection. So *Athanasius*, *ibid.* This second Formula not being to their Minds,

A Third was drawn up by *Theophronius* Bishop of Tyana, to which they all subscribed. This was in This Form. *I believe in One God, the Father almighty, the Creator and Maker of all things, from whom are all things; and in his only begotten Son, God, Word, Power, and Wisdom, Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom are all things, begotten of the Father before Ages, perfect God of perfect God, and being with the Father,*

ἐν ὑπόστασι, in Substance, came down from Heaven in these last Days; and, born of a Virgin, according to the Scriptures, became man, suffered, and rose from the Dead, and ascended into Heaven and sat at the right Hand of his Father. And shall come again with Glory and Power to judge the Quick and Dead, and shall continue for ever. And in the Holy Ghost, the Paraclet, the Spirit of Truth, whom God promised by the Prophet to pour out upon his Servants, and the Lord promised to send to his Disciples, whom he also sent as the Acts of the Apostles testify.

There were ninety Bishops, says *Athanasius*, that met at *Antioch* at the Dedication of the Church there, *Marcellinus* and *Probinus* being Consuls, A. D. 341. A few Months after, *μὲν μὴνας ὀλίγους*, These Fathers made a Fourth Confession of Faith; and they sent it to *Gallia* by *Narcissus* of *Cilicia*, *Theodorus* of *Tbrace*, *Marris* of *Calcedon*, and *Marcus* of *Syria*, and laid it before *Constans*. The Form itself is extant in *Athanasius de Symbolis*. But neither doth this, more than any of the preceeding ones, say any thing more, than to explain what was to be believed concerning the Holy Ghost: Not a Word is mentioned concerning the Communion of Saints, the Forgiveness of Sins, the Resurrection of the Body, or the Life everlasting.

The First Council of *Antioch* was held, as was before observed, A. D. 341. and then they sent to *Constans* the Creed just now mentioned. Three Years afterwards They met again, and made a New Creed, and sent *Eudoxius*, *Martyrius*, and *Macedonius* of *Cilicia*, and several others, into *Italy*, carrying with them a long Creed, which, from the Length of it was called *μακρογυνικός*; vide *Socrat.* l. i. c. 19. *Sozom.* l. iii.

c. 11. *Athan. de Synod.* But notwithstanding its Length, and its being sent to *Italy*, no Objection was made to it as to any Deficiency, tho' there was not a Word in it relating to the *Resurrection of the Flesh*. *Socrates* tells us, that this Creed was not received by the *Western Bishops*, because it was wrote in Greek, a Language they were ignorant of. But the Truth was, They thought that what was settled at *Nice* was enough; that though the Fathers at *Antioch* seem'd plain enough to strike at the Notions of *Arius*, yet the *Western Bishops* found that they avoided the Use of the Term, *Consubstantial*. But as they rejected this Creed, and contended that no more than the *Nicene* should be admitted, I gather that at this time the *Western Bishops* had more in their Creeds than the *Eastern* had; and consequently all that follows the *Holy Ghost* in the *Apostles Creed* was added even after A. D. 344. when this long Creed was first sent into *Italy*.

We come now to the Council held at *Sardica*, a City of *Illyrium*; a Council designed by the Two Emperors *Constans* and *Constantius* to be Oecumenical; and therefore the Bishops of Both the East and West were called to meet at it. It consisted chiefly of the *Western Bishops*, the *Eastern Bishops* soon retiring from it. It was held, *Ruffinus* and *Eusebius* being Consuls, in the XIth Year after *Constantine's* Death, i. e. A. D. 347. *Socrates* tells us, that about Three Hundred of the *Western Bishops* met there, and from the *East* about Seventy-Six: and for this he quotes *Athanasius* and *Sabinus*, l. ii. c. 20. *Sozomen* makes the same Numbers meet, E. H. lib. iii. c. 12. *Athanasius* himself, in his second Apology, says there were 284. p. 768. But be

D

they

they more, or fewer, as soon as they met, the *Eastern* Bishops refused to come into company with the *Western*, unless they would expel *Athanasius*, and *Paul* of *Constantinople*, from their Assembly. When this was warmly opposed by the famous *Hosius* of *Corduba*, and *Protopogenes* of *Sardica*, the Eastern Bishops left the Council and withdrew to *Philippopolis*, a City of *Thrace*, and there held a Council by themselves. *Socrat.* l. ii. c. 20. The Western Bishops first deprived the Accusers of *Athanasius* of their Honours, says *Socrates*, *ibid.* And then the *Eastern* excommunicated Pope *Julius*, because he had communicated with *Athanasius*. Then they did the same to *Hosius*, and some others. We have nothing remaining of this Council held at *Philippopolis* besides a Form of Faith drawn up by them, and a circular Letter they sent to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons of the Whole Church. As to the Creed they drew up, they profess a *Belief in One God --- and in One Lord Jesus Christ ---- who -- rose from the Dead, and was taken up into Heaven, and sitteth at the right Hand of the Father, will come again to judge the Quick and the Dead, to give to every one according to his Works, whose Kingdom continues without ceasing through immense Ages; for he sits at the right Hand of the Father not only in this Age, but in that which is to come. We believe also in the Holy Ghost, that is, the Paraclet, whom he promised to his Apostles after his Return to Heaven, and sent to teach them, and to call to Remembrance all things, by whom the Souls of them that sincerely believe in him are sanctified.* They add according to the Customs of the Times, certain *Anathemas* against such as they condemned. But not

not a Word is there in their Creed concerning *the Resurrection of the Flesh*.

When I say this, I should observe that this Creed is cited three different ways. In the One there is nothing added, after what is said about their Belief in the *Holy Ghost*, except the usual Anathemas. And thus *Baronius* cites it, and *Binius*. And thus it is cited by *Labbe* in his Account of this Council, p. 699. A Second Form is made use of by *Hilary*, who alone has preserved this Creed; and in him there is this Addition, "Credimus in Sanctam Ecclesiam, in remissionem peccatorum, in vitam eternam:" *We believe in the holy Church, the Forgiveness of Sins, and in Life everlasting*. And Thirdly, among the *Fragments of Hilary*, there is a *Synodal Epistle* of this *Sardican Council* of the Eastern Bishops, wrote to all the Bishops in the World, wherein they send the Form of the Creed to which they subscribed; in which they say, "Credimus et in Sanctam Ecclesiam, in remissionem, or remissionem peccatorum, in Carnis Resurrectionem, in vitam eternam." *We believe in the holy Church, in the Forgiveness of Sins, in the Resurrection of the Flesh, in Life everlasting*.

Now this last Form, which contains the Article of the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, could not be the *Genuine* Form to which these Eastern Bishops subscribed: For *Hilary*, who has given us the Creed itself, has omitted the Article of the *Resurrection*. 2. As this is the first time it is mentioned by any *Eastern Council*, and is not mentioned by any subsequent *Eastern Council* for many Years, it seems to be an *Interpolation* taken from the *Western Creeds*, in, or after, the days of *Hilary*. 3. The Council of

Antioch, held but Six Years before this at *Sardica*, hesitated much about admitting this Article into their Creed. And probably they were now beginning to add this Article about the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, as they did the Articles of the *Church*, and of *Forgiveness of Sins*, and *Life everlasting*.

But whether this Clause was in the Creed of this *Sardican* Meeting of the Bishops, or not, it is certain that, after this time, when the Council at *Sirmium* was held, it was not put into any of their Creeds. I enter not into the Disputes of learned Men, which of the Creeds I am going to mention was the *First*, or *Second*, or *Third*: i. e. Whether the Creeds extant, or which of them, was drawn up A. D. 351, or 357, or 359. *Socrates* tells us, that there was one which *Marcus Arethufius* drew up in *Greek*, and that there were two others wrote in *Latin*, “ σύμφωνον οὐκ ἔχοντας ἕτε ἢ λείων, “ ἕτε ἢ σωθῆσιν, ἕτε πρὸς ἑαυτὰς, ἕτε μὴ πρὸς “ ἢ ἑλληνικῶν,” which did not agree with that of *Arethufius*’s, neither in *Diction*, nor *Composition*, nor with one another, nor with the *Greek* one. *Soc.* lib. ii. c. 30. *Sozom.* lib. iv. c. 6. *Valefius* contends, that the *Three Sirmian* Creeds were published by Three different Assemblies: And it is very likely they were so. And it is probable that *Arethufius*’s was the last of the Three, in A. D. 359. It is no great Matter which of the Three is *First* or *Last*, as to the present Enquiry, since in none of them is there a Word about the *Resurrection of the Flesh*.

The Creed which *Marcus Arethufius* drew up, as *Socrates* tells us, ended with the Belief of the *Holy Ghost*, i. e. the *Paraclet*, whom the Lord having promised to his Disciples, sent after his ascent
into

into Heaven, that he might teach them, and bring to their Remembrance all things, through whom the Souls of them that sincerely believe in him are sanctified. Just in the Words of the Council of *Sardica* before cited.

The Second Creed, published at *Sirmium*, and which the famous *Hosius* subscribed A. D. 357, was wrote in *Latin*. The Historians tell us that *Hosius* was compelled by *Necessity* to consent, and subscribe to it, the old Man being beat, and otherwise used with Cruelty, to force him to sign ----- They imagining that his Name might be of great Use to bring their Creed into Credit. This Form is almost all taken up in explaining what ought to be believed concerning the Generation of the Son; and it ends with a Belief of the Holy Ghost, who being sent by the Son, came according to the Promise, that he might sanctify, and make manifest the Apostles and all Believers, *Socrat. l. 2. c. 30.*

The Third Creed too, probably the First in point of Time, mentions Christ's sitting at the right Hand of the Father, and coming in the Glory of the Father, that he might give to every one according to his Works. And in the Holy Ghost, whom the same only begotten Son of God promised that he would send to Mankind, the Paraclet, as it is written, I go to my Father, and will ask the Father, and he will send another Comforter to you, the Spirit of Truth, &c. *Socrat. lib. ii. c. 37.* This Third Form was drawn up at *Sirmium*, by *Ursacius* and *Valens*, but kept private till Another Time might happen more favourable; and was first published at *Ariminum*, A. D. 359.

But before I pass to This, I must take notice of a spurious Letter of *Athanasius* and the *Egyptian*

Bishops to Pope Liberius, and Liberius's Answer to them.

The Letter of *Athanasius* recites the *Nicene Creed*, and has nothing added after the Words ---- *And in the Holy Spirit.* *Liberius* answers, *Fidem Nicæni Concilii in eadem Epistola rectam reperimus* ---- “ *We find the Faith of the Nicene Council to be right,*” and adds “ *Aliam Fidem nulli licere proferre, aut conscribere vel componere, that it was not lawful for any Man to produce, or write, or compose any other Creed, and if any one presumed to teach or deliver any other Creed, if they were Bishops or Clergymen, they were to be deprived; if Laymen, to be anathematized.*”

This Answer, directed to “ *Athanasius and the Egyptian Bishops, who thought rightly concerning the Belief of the Trinity,*” is dated the 8th of the Calends of June, *Asclepius* and *Deodatus* being *Consuls*. Now as there are no such *Consuls* in the *Fasti*, *Binius* justly thinks both the Letter of *Athanasius*, and That of *Liberius* to him, of suspected Credit. Nor can he assign a Time for the writing of them, whether it was in *Julian's* or *Valen's* Reign. However, about these Times we may place another Letter of *Liberius* to *Athanasius*, wherein he shews that *God the Word took upon him perfect Man*, but in it he mentions nothing about a *Resurrection*. *Athanasius*, in his Answer to *Liberius*, speaks of the *Flesh of Christ*, as *Mortal*, *He not being Mortal; as Visible, He not being Visible;* and when he had spoken of the *Trinity*, he adds, “ οὕτως καὶ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν πιστάδομεν, τουτέστι τῷ σώματος ἡμῶν καὶ τὰς αἰγίας γραφὰς τῷ φθαρεῖ καὶ θνητῷ αὐτῷ μεταβαλλομένου εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ ἀθανασίαν ὑπὸ τῷ Θεῷ. Likewise we believe the Resurrection

rection of the Flesh, *i. e.* of our Body according to the Holy Scriptures; His Corruptible and Mortal being changed into Immortality and Incorruption by God. Athanas. p. 244. Liberius takes no Notice of the Article of the Resurrection of the Flesh. Athanasius does it by way of Inference. We believe the Resurrection of the Flesh, *i. e.* of our Bodies, His, ἀντὶς, Corruptible and Mortal being changed by God into Incorruption and Immortality. In the Councils both by Binius and Labbe, it is said, "Ita quoque Carnis Resurrectionem credimus, hoc est, Corpus nostrum secundum sacras scripturas ex corruptibili mortali in incorruptibilitatem et in immortalitatem a Deo mutandum esse." But in Athanasius's own Letter it is, That Christ's Body, not Our Bodies, shall be changed by God from Corruptible to Incorruptible, *vide* Binius Concil. vol. i. p. 588. Labbei Concil. vol. ii. p. 768. This was about the Year of our Lord 357. But this Letter of Liberius, and the Answer of Athanasius, are justly suspected of being forged.

Differences still continuing between the Orthodox, as they were called, and the Arians; and the lesser Synods at Sardica, and Sirmium, not putting an end to the Disputes among the Clergy, as the Emperor Constantius desired, He resolved to call an Oecumenical Synod; and to divide it into Two Parts; That the Eastern Bishops should meet at Seleucia in Isauria, The Western Bishops at Ariminum in Italy. This Assembly was held A. D. 359, Eusebius and Hypatius being Consuls. At Ariminum or Rimini, met no less than Four Hundred Bishops from Illyricum, Italy, Africa, Spain, Gaul, &c. and they were maintained at the Emperor's Expence. Here, the same Creed that was read at Sirmium before the Emperor,

was recited on the 11th of the Calends of *June*. When they come to that Part of the Creed, where they mention Christ, they say, they believe --- " that he will come at the Last Day " of the Resurrection in the Glory of the " Father, that he may give to every one according to his Works. And in the Holy " Spirit, whom the Only Begotten promised " that he would send to Mankind, the Paraclet, as it is written, *I go to my Father, and will ask him, and he will send another Comforter to you, the Spirit of Truth; He shall receive of mine, and teach you, and put you in mind of all things.*" Here their Creed ends, and nothing is said about the Church, or the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, or the *Forgiveness of Sins*: Nor when *Athanasius* wrote his Remarks upon this *Formula of Faith*, did he make any Objection to their Omission of this, or other Articles, as *Socrates* observes, lib. ii. c. 37. but only to their Omission of the Word, *Consubstantial*.

As this was what passed at *Ariminum*, the Eastern Bishops met at *Seleucia*; and were about One Hundred and Sixty in Number, as *Socrates* and *Athanasius* say. Others, as *Theodoret*, say One Hundred and Fifty only, lib. ii. c. 27. In this Synod there were great Differences, Some accusing Others, Some adhering to *Acaſius*, Others rejecting him: And when they came to the Affair of a Creed, many of the Bishops were for the *Nicene Creed*, and for no other; others were for That of *Antioch*. There being so little Agreement here, and the Council being divided into Two Parties, One of them subscribed the Creed of *Antioch*. But this done, *the Doors being fastened*, the next Day *Acacius* objected to what had been done, as it were *in secret*, and then he read

a Form of Creed, in which he likewise took no more Notice of the Resurrection of the *Flesh* or *Body* than what is contained in those Words, that *Christ would come in Glory to judge the Quick and Dead*, Socrat. lib. ii. c. 40.

This Council being dismissed, and That at *Ariminum* still sitting, there was held at *Constantinople* a Synod of Fifty Bishops, who affirmed the Creed of *Ariminum*, adding only some things to it, but still there is not a tittle relative to the Article of the *Resurrection of the Flesh*.

Had there at this time been any such Article in the *Western Church*, could it possibly not have been inserted into the Creed of *Ariminum*? Could so many Bishops from *Italy, Gaul, Britain, Spain*, meet, and not take notice of such an Article, had it been in their *Baptismal Creed*? It is true, that their great Point was, to fix a true Notion of the *Person* and *Quality* of the Son of God: But had they had any farther Articles in their Creeds, they would have been mentioned, as in fact we meet with them recited wherever they were inserted.

The next Symbol of Faith I meet with, is in *Epiphanius's Anchorate*, wrote, as appears by the Marks of the Year, which he has set down A. D. 374. In this he recites a Creed very like to That which was seven Years after established at *Constantinople*; and which is known by the Name of the *Constantinopolitan Creed*. It should seem as if *Epiphanius* was the Author of This, and the Council of *Constantinople* approved of it, and established it, with very little Alteration, when they met together, seven Years after. *Epiphanius* observes, that Ἡμεῖς καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἀγία Καθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία, πρὸς τὰ ἀνάκυψάσας αἰρέσεις ἀκολουθῶς τῇ τῷ ἁγίων ὁμείνων πατέρων προεγεταμένην πίσει, οὕτως λέγομεν, μάλιστα τοῖς

τοῖς τῷ ἁγίῳ λουτρῷ περσιῶσιν, ἵνα ἀπαγγέλλωσι
 καὶ λέγωσιν ὁμῶς. “ *We, and all Orthodox Bishops,*
 “ *and all the holy Catholic Church, say thus against*
 “ *the rising Heresies, agreeably to the Faith before*
 “ *ordained of those Holy Fathers,*” he means the
 Nicene Fathers, “ especially to those who come
 “ to the sacred Font, that they may profess and
 “ say thus.” Here he recites a Creed in these
 Words --- *We believe in one God, the Father al-*
mighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, of all things
both visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus
Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the
Father before all Ages, that is of the Substance of
the Father, Light of Light, very God of very God,
begotten not made, of one Substance with the Father,
by whom all things were made, both which are in
Heaven, and which are in Earth, who for us Men
and for our Salvation came down from Heaven, and
was incarnate by the Holy Ghost and the Virgin
Mary, and was made Man, was crucified for us un-
der Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried,
and rose again the third Day according to the Scrip-
tures, and ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the
right Hand of the Father, and shall come again with
Glory to judge the Quick and Dead, of whose King-
dom there shall be no End. And in the Holy Ghost,
the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from
the Father, who with the Father and the Son is
worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Propbets.
 In one Holy Catholic Church. *We acknowledge*
one Baptism for the Remission of Sins, we look for
the Resurrection of the Dead, and Life in the
World to come. Amen. He then proceeds to give
 us a larger Creed, wherein he paraphrases this
 shorter; and when he comes to speak of the Re-
 surrection of the Dead, he adds, καὶ κριθῶσι δίκαιαν
 ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, “ we look for a just judgment
 “ of

“ of Souls and Bodies.” And here we first meet with an Anathema on those *who did not profess the Resurrection of the Dead*, ἀναθεματίζομεν τὰς μὴ ὁμολογοῦντας ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν.

But though *Epiphanius* thus explains his Notions, and anathematizes those who did not *profess the Resurrection of the Dead*, yet when the General Council at *Constantinople* met, a few Years after, A. D. 381. *Syagrius* and *Euchorius* being Consuls, we find they did not put into their Creed (whatever Opinion they might have) *the Resurrection of the Flesh, or Body*, but kept to the Scripture Language, *the Resurrection of the Dead*: and so it has continued ever since in the East.

Let us now stop a little, and review what has been said.

First, We have not met with any *Public Creed*, before This of *Constantinople*, and this so late as A. D. 381, where there has been placed an Article of even *the Resurrection of the Dead*. Nor is there any *Private Creed*, except one of *Arius*, and that just before mentioned of *Epiphanius*, that contains even such Article.

Secondly, Here we find several additional Articles which no *Public Creed* before This contained, viz. *One holy Catholic Church*; *one Baptism for the Remission of Sins*, *the Resurrection of the Dead*; and *Life in the World to come*.

Thirdly, Whatever private Notions prevailed among Christians, yet we meet with no Creeds drawn up by any body, on any Occasion, wherein the *Resurrection of the Body or Flesh* is made an Article, before that of *Arius* and *Euzoius*, some time after the Council of *Nice*. We have one drawn up by *Eusebius*, which was read in the Presence of *Constantine*, containing,
what

what he says he received from his Predecessors, and what he was instructed in, when he received the first Rudiments of Christianity. Upon the Profession of this Creed he tells us that he was *baptized*; and it contained what he believed; and what he taught when he was a *Presbyter*, and when he was a *Bishop*. And in this there was no such Article. We have too the Creed of *Lucian* the Martyr, which the Fathers of the Synod at *Antioch* affirmed to be wrote in his own Hand, and which was there produced and read. *Sozom.* E. H. l. iii. 5. Here too we find nothing about the Resurrection of the *Body* or *Flesh*.

Fourthly, Tho' none of the Creeds hitherto mentioned, except that of *Arius* and *Euzoius* contained in express Words the Resurrection of the *Body* or *Flesh*; or even of the *Dead*, except that of *Epiphanius*, yet all believed even from the Beginning, and they all declared their Belief of the Resurrection of the *Dead*, by asserting that Christ shall come again to judge both the *Quick* and the *Dead*, and shall give to every Man according to his Works. Whilst all professed this Faith, it necessarily followed, that all should be raised from the *Dead*: And therefore there was no Deficiency in their Creeds, tho' there was no such Article expressed in Terms in them.

Fifthly, *Arius*, as I have observed, first mentioned in his Creed the Resurrection of the *Flesh*. This he did when he presented his Creed to *Constantine*, in order to get himself restored to the Church, in or about the Year 327. It was after *Constantia's* Death, who was Sister to *Constantine*, and Wife of *Licinius*. The next Time we have any Hint of this, as an Article proper for a Creed, is *A. D.* 341, in the Council of *Antioch*. And at this Time it is mention'd in a very extraordinary

nary Manner, as is already observed,---*If any Thing ought to be added, we believe the Resurrection of the Flesh.* These Fathers had been particularly cautious not to be deemed Followers of *Arius*, and they thought it wrong to add to the usual Creed any such Article as *Arius* and *Euzoius* had done : And tho' they conceived such Addition *might* be made, yet they would not venture to have any such Addition in any of their Creeds there drawn up.

Sixthly, I have taken Notice that in the second Century, especially towards the Middle and latter End of it, the Notion prevailed amongst many, that there was to be a Resurrection of the *Body or Flesh.* *Atbanasius* afterwards espoused this Notion ; and now I must add that *Cyril of Jerusalem*, in his Catechetical Lectures, (read as *Dr. Cave* supposes, *A. D.* 347.) recites the latter Part of his Creed, as if it were in this Form,---
 “ We believe one *Baptism of Repentance for the*
 “ *Remission of Sins ; and in one Catholic Church ;*
 “ *in the Resurrection of the Flesh ; and in Life*
 “ *everlasting.*” *Cyril*, p. 220. And he makes *Body and Flesh* to be the same Thing, as others had done when they wrote on this Subject. The Article then of the *Resurrection of the Flesh* was in *Cyril's* Creed, in the Year 347. But yet it did not prevail in the *Eastern Church*, for thirty-four Years after this. For when the Council of *Constantinople* was held, they established only the *Resurrection of the Dead*, tho' they took into their Creed the three other Articles, which *Cyril* expounded.

Let us now pass from the *East* to the *West.* It was no where said, that I remember, at what Time this Article of the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, was first inserted into the *Apostle's Creed.* For the

the Story of its being made by the twelve Apostles, each of them contributing an Article as *Ruffinus* says, is now rejected by all as a mere Fable. He tells us, that "in diversis Ecclesiis" "aliqua in his verbis inveniuntur adjecta," i. e. *In divers Churches some Things are found to be added to these Words of the Creed.* But then he adds, "In Ecclesia tamen Urbis Romæ hoc non" "deprehenditur factum; *In the Church of the City of Rome this is not found to be done.* Could we then know, what the Creed of the Church of the City of *Rome* was, we might possibly see the original *Baptismal* Creed of that Place. But the Mischief is, that in all other Places, "quantum" "intelligi datur, propter nonnullos hæreticos addita quædam videntur," as far as *Ruffinus* "could possibly find out, some Things seem to be added on Account of some Hereticks or other," by which Means the Sense of novel Doctrines were thought to be guarded against. Unless therefore he had given us the *Roman* Creed in particular, and had compared with that some other Creed, marking the Agreements and Disagreements with it, we cannot be certain what that was in its Purity. *Ruffinus* has wrote a Comment on the Creed of the Church of *Aquileia*; and that contained several Additions to that of *Rome*. Eg. The Creed of *Aquileia* did not contain the Article of Christ's *Descent into Hell*: the *Roman* did. The *Aquileian* Creed expresses the Article of the Resurrection of the *Flesh* by the Addition of the Pronoun *THIS*,---*The Resurrection of THIS Flesh*: Neither the *Roman*, nor any other Creed in the World has the Word *THIS*. It is not certain that the *Roman* Creed had the last Article---*Life everlasting*; the *Aquileian* Creed had it not. Now *Ruffinus* flourished after the Council of *Constantinople*,

noble, suppose about 390 or later: If therefore this Article was *now* inserted into the *Western* Creeds, it is not much to be wondered at, since all believed the Resurrection of the Dead, and many had got into the Notion of a Resurrection of the Flesh, however different it is from the Article in the Original, which alone is the Article to be believed.

Ruffinus asserts, that the Error of *Valentinus*, and the *Manichæans*, and the *Objections* of the *Heathens*, were the Reasons of the Insertion of the Article of the *Resurrection* of the *Flesh*. “ Nam “ *Valentinus Resurrectionem carnis omni modo* “ *negat ; & Manichæi.*” And when he had cited some Passages of Scripture in Confutation of them, he goes on, “ *Sed Infideles clamant & dicunt, &c.*” *How can Flesh which is putrified, and turned into Dust, or is dispersed by the Waves of the Sea be recollected ? &c.* Whether it be right to enlarge Creeds, in order to put a Stop to Errors, I presume not to judge, but if it was inserted on Account of the common Objections of *Valentinus* and the *Manichæans*, it was not inserted till after *Manes’s* Time, *i. e.* not before the Year 300 at soonest. But then it is certain it was not inserted at the Time of the Council of *Ariminum*, as was proved above; therefore it was inserted in the *Roman Creed* after *A. D. 359*.

There is a Creed which hitherto I have taken no Notice of, tho’ there have been some Men who are ready to pay as much Deference to it, as to any Part of the sacred Writings ; I mean the Creed that occurs in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, a Book so senseless ! that no Evidence can prove it to be the Effect of Inspiration. The Pronunciation of this Creed at Baptism is so minutely set down, and every Circumstance of *renouncing the Devil*, is so described, that nothing can be more exact and formal

formal. They profess a Faith "with *πᾶσι τοῖς*
πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ εἰς σαρκὸς
ἀνάστησιν καὶ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς βασιλεί-
αν ἑρανῶν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.
Apost. Constitut. Lib. VII. c. 41. i. e. with all
Believers in the Holy Catholic Church, in the
Resurrection of the Flesh, and in the Remis-
sion of Sins, and in the Kingdom of Heaven,
and in the Life of the World to come." If one
 looks back to *Arius* and *Euzoius's* Creed, we shall
 find these very Articles ranged indeed in a little dif-
 ferent Order, but exactly the same. *Their* Creed
 was, we believe *in the Resurrection of the Flesh,*
and Life in the World to come, and in the King-
dom of Heaven, and in the one Catholic Church
of God, from one End of the World to the other.
 This in the *Constitutions* contains just the same Ar-
 ticles, tho' placed somewhat differently. This
 Creed therefore is formed upon the Plan of *Arius*
 and *Euzoius's* Creed, and consequently is poste-
 rior to that, and probably was drawn up about,
 or rather before the Middle of the *Fourth* Century,
 when this Article began to have its Advocates,
 and was placed by some in the public Creeds.

And now, one cannot help observing, that
 among all the numerous Creeds here produced,
 there is not one in any Part of the World, earlier
 than the *fourth* Century, in which the *Resurrection*
of the Flesh is mentioned at all. It was before
 that Time indeed the Subject of Controversy;
 and learned Men debated the Question, some
 professing their private Opinion, that the very
 Bodies they bore about them were to be raised;
 that the Bodies that sinned were to suffer. So
 did *Irenæus* in *France*; and so did *Tertullian*,
 and not very long after, so did *Cyprian* in *Africa*;
 and *Athenagoras*, and *Theophilus* wrote professedly
 to vindicate this Doctrine, In the East, the first
 Time

Time it is at all mentioned, is in a Creed of *Arius* and *Euzoius*, delivered to the Emperor *Constantine* the Great, not long after the Council of *Nice*: And thence it is in the *Apostolic Constitutions*: When it is first mentioned by any Council, was *A. D.* 341; and there it is mentioned in such a Manner, as evidently proves it not to have been in any Creed whatever in those Parts of the World. Six Years after we meet with it in *Cyril's* Creed at *Jerusalem*, *A. D.* 347. with the *additional Articles* that *Arius* put into his Creed. But still the Councils of *Sardica* and *Sirmium*, and *Ariminum*, did not insert any such Article; nor did the Council of *Constantinople* go into any particular *Modus* of the Resurrection, but speaks as the Scriptures do, saying, *We look for the Resurrection of the Dead*, *A. D.* 381.

2. The spurious Creed forged by somebody under the Name of *Athanasius*, and is commonly called the *Athanasian Creed*, has this Article: But then it is on all Hands agreed, that this Forgery was not at soonest before the *fifth Century*.

3. One may easily conceive to what Lengths this Article was carried, when in the Creed of the *Aquileian Church*, it was expressed, I believe, "*Resurrectionem hujus carnis*," the *Resurrection of this Flesh*: contrary not only to the Doctrine of Scripture, but to all other Creeds that ever were formed in the whole World.

4. As the *Roman Creed* is the shortest Creed of all others, and has omitted several Things that are in the *Aquileian Creed*. This ended with the *Resurrection of the Flesh*; and the oldest Copy we know of this Creed, even so late as *A. D.* 703. had not what it now concludes with *Life everlasting*, Vid. *Usser de Symbolis*. But the Article

E

of

of the Resurrection of the Flesh was not in it when the Council sat at *Ariminum*.

Lastly, it is well known, that that great and honest Man *Synefius*, thought that he saw so much Absurdity in the commonly received Notion of the *Resurrection*, that he resolved never to submit to be ordained a Bishop, rather than to pretend to believe an Article which he could not believe. It was by his Time, *i. e.* about the Year 420, got to be so general an Article of Faith, that very few, if any, had any Hesitation about it. It was become almost an universal Notion; *καθωμιλημένη ἀνάστασις*, a commonly preached Resurrection, a Doctrine every where taught: but what he could not profess nor pretend to believe; nor would he come into what he thought a groundless Hypotheses of the Multitude.

From the Account before given of the Rise and Growth of this Notion of the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, it seems to follow clearly, that in all Points which depend upon Revelation, Men should confine themselves rigidly to the Scripture Language, and not to be wise above what is written. When Men recede from that, and add *human* Doctrines to *divine* ones, they always involve themselves in Difficulties unfurmountable. If the Curiosity of idle or vain People, had not led them to a particular Explication of the general Article of the Resurrection of the *Dead*, how many Disputes had been avoided? If one looks into the History of this Doctrine, one cannot but see, that tho' our baptismal Creed is now determinate for a Belief of the *Resurrection* of the *Body* or *Flesh*, yet three hundred and fifty Years passed before there was any such Notion required to be professed in the Christian Church: And so long as all are taught to believe, that *all are to be judged, Quick and*

and Dead; that all are to stand at the Judgment Seat of Christ, and that he will come again, and render to every one according to his Works, is it not raising an idle Question to ask, With what Bodies shall we come? And if any one answers such a Question, by saying--in THIS Flesh---does he not assert more than Revelation has taught him, tho' it is what nothing but Revelation can assure him of? And should the Consequence be, what actually has been, that Unbelievers raise an Objection from hence against Christianity itself, Believers are answerable for it, as teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.

The Growth of Infidelity has long been the Subject of great Complaint amongst serious well-meaning People: May it not be worth considering, whether the true Cause of Infidelity does not lie amongst those who profess a Faith which they call Christian, and which is found inconsistent with Reason, and even common Sense? Every one that examines at all, will see Additions made to the great Articles of Christianity. How many *Additions* were made to what the Gospel of Christ has said, concerning the Son and the Holy Ghost, in the several Creeds framed in the Fourth Century? This possibly was then done with a good Design to fence in, and to secure a right Faith: But whatever was the Design, it has been attended with Consequences fatal to Christianity itself. The *Fences* have been considered as the *Thing fenced in*; and when Men have seen Things that they cannot comprehend or understand, taught as Fundamentals of *Christianity*, it is natural to reject what is unintelligible as impossible to be required by God: And thus must *Infidelity* prevail. Whereas if one takes the Religion of Christ as it lies in the Word of God, it is *pure, peaceable,*

no Ways contrary to Reason, *intelligible* by every Body, so far as every Body is concerned. The Evidence for its Truth is clear and plain, and easy. *The Poor had the Gospel preached unto them at first, as well as the Rich; and the Poor are to be saved as well as the Rich, and therefore the one can understand what is required of him by Christ as well as the other.* But then if Men will presume to take the Word of God into their Hands, and will new mould and frame it as they think fit; and will make what is easy to be hard and unintelligible, and then will anathematise and persecute Men for refusing to profess what they do not understand, there will always be Infidelity covered under the Mask of Christianity; and Christianity, or what is called so, will be slyly or openly attacked; and till it is professed pure and uncorrupted, it must have its Enemies; and if Offences arise, *Woe unto him by whom the Offence cometh.*

F I N I S.

22 JY 69